



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,945	06/02/2000	Todd D. Turnidge	SUN1P283/P4906	5544

22434 7590 06/02/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/585,945

Applicant(s)

TURNIDGE, TODD D.

Examiner

Kevin Parton

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/24/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the following reasons and the grounds of rejection stated below.

2. Applicant presents arguments regarding "Cited Art Distinguished." The arguments are not persuasive because although the Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) reference does teach a virtual web browser, this is not the portion of the reference used. The reference teaches a web server that handles requests and generates test response data based on the requests. The claimed invention reads on the web server of Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) not the virtual web browser, which is an additional limitation of the Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) reference that is not relied upon. The Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) reference is used to show that a virtual machine can function as a web server as well. The combination of the two, with the associated motivation shown below, render obvious the claimed invention.

3. Applicant further presents arguments regarding "Claim 1." The arguments are not persuasive because although the Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) reference does teach a virtual web browser, this is not the portion of the reference relied upon. The Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teaches a web server that handles requests and returns response data to tests. These are functions of Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) that are relied upon in the grounds of rejection, not the virtual web browser. The Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) reference is used to show that a virtual machine can function as a web server as well. The combination of the two, with the associated motivation shown below, render obvious the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2153

4. Applicant further presents arguments regarding "Claims 2-12." All of the reasons above apply to these claims as well. Further, the Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) reference does show that queries are used to give insight into the operation of the queried devices (web servers). Performance data does specify information about the operation of a device, virtual or otherwise. All amendments have been addressed in the new grounds of rejection below.

5. Applicant further presents arguments regarding "Claims 13 and 26." The Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) reference shows the response of a web server to queries about performance and operation. These requests are directed to web servers as shown in figure 2 and in column 6, lines 11-15. For all the reasons shown above and below in the new grounds of rejection, the reference is still applicable. Again, the queries to the web server are replied to and give insight into the operation of the device. All amended aspects of the claims are addressed below in the new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398).

8. Regarding claim 1, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach a web server comprising:

Art Unit: 2153

- a. A request handler worker for handling queries relating to the server (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 6-10). A web server is disclosed and it handles test requests.
- b. A plurality of services wherein a service performs operations for replying to an incoming query (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 6, lines 12-15).
- c. An operations worker for constructing output containing a reply to the incoming query, wherein the reply provides insight into or effects the operation of the server (column 8, lines 8-10, 27-31).

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual

Art Unit: 2153

machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

9. Regarding claim 2, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the request handler is an http thread (column 7, lines 17-19; column 17, lines 27-28). Note that in the reference, the html references are used over the web via http.

10. Regarding claim 3, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 2. They further teach means wherein the incoming query is in http format (column 7, lines 17-19; column 17, lines 27-28). Note that in the reference, the html references are used over the web via http.

11. Regarding column 4, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the request handler worker further includes a query parser for parsing the incoming query such that one of the plurality of services is identified for use by the operations worker to generate the reply to the incoming query (column 8, lines 6-8; column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that the web server of the reference is being tested.

12. Regarding claim 5, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the request handler is created upon starting the server (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the web server receives requests, parses them, retrieves the data, and returns it. This is all part of the standard function of a web server. Also, note that the functions of the server would not be available until startup.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

13. Regarding claim 6, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the request handler worker functions as a network traffic manager for routing queries and responses (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the web server receives requests, parses them, retrieves the data, and returns it. This is all part of the standard function of a web server. Also, note that web server inherently has a request handler that will route requests in and out of the system.

14. Regarding claim 7, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the plurality of services contains an index of

Art Unit: 2153

available services and parameters for each service (column 10). Note that in the reference, the program accesses the services and the full list or index is shown in the table.

15. Regarding claim 8, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the operation worker is a server operations thread (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the web server receives requests, parses them, retrieves the data, and returns it. This is all part of the standard function of a web server. Note that the actual function of the web server's applications can be referred to as an operations thread.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.



16. Regarding claim 9, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means for transferring data between the request handler worker and the operations worker (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the web server receives requests, parses them, retrieves the data, and returns it. This is all part of the standard function of a web server. Also, note that the ability of two components acting within a single server will be able to communicate.

17. Regarding claim 10, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 9. They further teach means wherein the request handler worker creates the request data structure that identifies one of the plurality of services to be used by the operations worker for generating the reply to the incoming query (column 8, lines 6-8; column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the web server receives requests, parses them, retrieves the data, and returns it. This is all part of the standard function of a web server. Also, note that request structure is common in a web system, but the internal workings of the web server may change the format of the request to suit the server-based applications.

18. Regarding claim 11, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 9. They further teach means for identifying the one of the plurality of services to be used by the operations worker for generating the reply to the incoming query (column 8, lines 6-8).

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein the request data structure has a service pointer area, a response buffer area, and a segment query area.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a service pointer area, response buffer, and segment query area in a request. These would all be useful in the return of data because each request will need to specify at least the service needed and the space for a reply. This benefits the system by allowing for a standardized request structure.

19. Regarding claim 12, although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the virtual machine is a Java virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein the virtual machine is a Java virtual machine (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a Java virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

20. Regarding claims 13 and 26, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach a system for handling an incoming query comprising:

- a. Invoking a network traffic worker for receiving the request (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that upon startup, the web server will have a mechanism for receiving a request.
- b. Receiving a request from a browser (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 10). Note that the browsers send in requests as input files.
- c. Processing the request to determine the service needed to respond to the request (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that the web server as a common function parses the requests.
- d. Creating a request data structure identifying the service needed to respond to the request (column 8, lines 6-8; column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that the web server must parse out the input file into individual commands and requests.
- e. Effecting a response to the request by passing the request data structure to a virtual machine operations worker, wherein the response provides insight into or effects the operation of the virtual machine (abstract; column 8, lines 6-8; column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10).
- f. Transmitting the response to the browser (figure 3). Note that this is a common function of a web server.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the system is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein the system is a virtual machine (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the it to run on any platform.

21. Regarding claim 14, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for invoking a web server in the virtual machine (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that in the reference, the system contains a web server.

22. Regarding claim 15, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 14. They further teach means for creating a request thread (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9). Note that a web server accepts requests as part of its general function.

23. Regarding claim 16, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 15. They further teach means wherein receiving a request from a browser further includes establishing a secure HTTP connection where the request is an HTTP request (column

7, lines 17-19; column 17, lines 27-28). Note that in the reference, the html references are used over the web via http. Note that the security of the connection may be based on the system setup.

24. Regarding claim 17, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means wherein processing the request further includes parsing the request into segments thereby determining the service needed to respond to the request (column 10; column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10). Note that the request is submitted as multiple lines of commands and requests. This may not all go to the same system, so it must be parsed.

25. Regarding claim 18, although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) (as applied to claim 17) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for creating a pointer to the service in a service library.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a service pointer. The server must have a method for knowing which services are being requested in each input file, pointers are a common way to implement this. This benefits the system by giving the server the capability to operate with constantly growing services.

26. Regarding claim 19, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for identifying the service needed to respond to a request (column 8, lines 6-8).

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein creating the request data structure includes creating a service pointer area, a response buffer area, and a segment query area.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a service pointer area, response buffer, and segment query area in a request. These would all be useful in the return of data because each request will need to specify at least the service needed and the space for a reply. This benefits the system by allowing for a standardized request structure.

27. Regarding claim 20, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 19. They further teach means for generating an HTTP response containing an HTML document (column 7, lines 17-19; column 17, lines 27-28). Note that in the reference, the html references are used over the web via http.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the response is stored in a third storage area of a request data structure.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing a request data

structure with placement specified for the result. This benefits the system by providing a common space for the result into a known format. In addition, the size of the result can be controlled thus not taking up more bandwidth than allowed.

28. Regarding claim 21, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 19. They further teach means for generating XML pages into the third storage area of the request data structure (column 7, lines 17-19; column 17, lines 27-28). Note that in the reference, the html references are used over the web via http. XML is just another markup language that can be used in web client server systems.

29. Regarding claim 22, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for performing operations in the server using the service and under the control of the server operations worker (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10). Note that in the reference, the server can provide responses to the clients via its server capabilities. This can be referred to as an operations worker.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

30. Regarding claim 23, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for stopping normal operation of the server while the request is acted upon (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10). Note that in the reference, the purpose of the test is to overwhelm the server. The server, if previously online, would have to be removed from all other work in order to retrieve accurate results.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al.



(USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

31. Regarding claim 24, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means for sending a response from the operations worker to the network traffic worker (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10). Note that in the reference, internal communications of the server allow this to occur.

Although the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the web server is a virtual machine.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398), as evidenced by Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619).

In an analogous art, Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619) discloses a system wherein a virtual machine functions as a web server (column 4, lines 61-63; column 6, line 60). Note that in the reference, the virtual machine is noted as being used as any type of server. The web server is specifically mentioned.

Given the teaching of Joffe et al. (USPN 6,185,619), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) by employing the use of a virtual machine as the web server. Virtual machines are common in many implementations with Java. This benefits the system by allowing the web server to run on any platform.

Art Unit: 2153

32. Regarding claim 25, Marullo et al. (USPN 6,044,398) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 13. They further teach means wherein transmitting the response to the browser further includes the network traffic manager sending the response to the browser (column 8, lines 27-31; column 23, lines 8-9; column 8, lines 8-10). Note that this is a common function of a web server.

***Conclusion***

33. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the


Art Unit: 2153

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-9242 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Kevin Parton  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2153

ksp  
May 28, 2003



GLENDON B. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100